



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

REVIEWS AND BOOK NOTICES.

Johannine Grammar. By EDWIN A. ABBOTT. London, Adam and Charles Black, 1906.

In bulk the gospel according to St. John is not a formidable document. It can easily be read in a couple of hours, and in the same couple of hours a practised syntactician could note, as he reads, all, or at least many of the syntactical deviations from what we are pleased to call the standard language, as if there were any standard in an eternal flux. Of course, it would take more time to sort out the phenomena, but a few mornings would suffice for that. This done, your classical scholar might think that he had absolved his task, and was prepared to pass judgment on the style of St. John, unless he should encounter the Johannine Grammar of Dr. Abbott, the author of the famous Shakespearian Grammar, to which all English scholars owe so much. The Johannine Grammar is the fruit of many years of arduous labor, intense thought, and patient observation, and your malapert syntactician would find that the study of St. John requires an amount of special knowledge that would justify any mere classical scholar in sternly refusing, as I have done for years, to give out any opinion whatsoever as to any point of New Testament interpretation. No wonder, then, that I am happy at being buttressed in this position by a stately bulk of 687 pp.

But it is hard for a syntactician in grain to dismiss so important a contribution to the study of Greek with a mere complimentary phrase. A fresh reading of the gospel suggests so many things. So f. i. one who has ever done any work in the literature of the Greek Renaissance is tempted to ask what a Hellenist of that artificial period would have thought of St. John's style. The emperor Julian must have read him in Cappadocia, but as Julian speaks sneeringly of Luke, stylistically the best of the evangelists, he could hardly have tolerated St. John, and I doubt whether that frivolous creature, Lucian, would have had the patience to read the sacred books of which Peregrinus made such bad use. And yet Lucian's testimony would have been valuable because his Greek was an acquired Greek, and it is a familiar observation that foreigners who have gained a mastery of English with a great sum of toil are always severer critics than natives, who fancy that they are free-born, and can be as slovenly as they please. There are worse subjects for a doctoral dissertation than: '*Quid Lucianus Samosatensis de Sancti Johannis elocutione sensurus fuerit*'. But I will leave that theme to younger

spirits, and indulge in another fancy. Suppose we stretch our imagination so far as to call the first six chapters of St. John an Oxyrhynchus fragment, found by some Hellenist, who knowing nothing of New Testament Greek and nothing of the momentous importance of the document, had nosed at it in a heathen spirit. 'Nosed at it' is the right phrase and was not suggested by Oxyrhynchus. On the contrary, Oxyrhynchus was suggested by the comparison. Your sagacious grammarian is often nothing better than the hound from which he gets his complimentary epithet. Dogs have a very limited range of vision, and are haunted, not as we are, by landscapes and seascapes, but by smellscapes. Indeed, I have known scholars who thought of the classics merely as combinations of grammatical smells. The type is familiar. It is the type of Smellfungus, own brother to Dryasdust. But the sense of smell is not to be despised for all that. It may save the life of a reading. It may detect the forger of an intercalated document, the forger of a book. No idle invocation is that: *ὁ ξύνεσι καὶ μυκτῆρες ὀσφρατῆριοι*. Now I am not going to inflict on the readers of the Journal an exhaustive syntactical commentary on the Gospel according to St. John or even on the first few chapters of the said gospel, but I do not know any easier way of showing the value of Dr. Abbott's book than by comparing his treatment of certain syntactical topics with the way in which I am wont to handle the same subjects, and if I refer to the A. J. P. from time to time it is not because of any startling novelty in my views but simply as a matter of personal convenience (A. J. P. XXVII 234). Without further apology, then, let us take up Chapter I. The very first thing at which our imaginary student would check is the preposition in the famous *καὶ ὁ λόγος ἦν πρὸς τὸν θεόν*. The trouble lies partly, if not wholly, in the Proteus *λόγος*, as Diels calls it. What is the *λόγος* in St. John? What for that matter is the *λόγος* in Herakleitos? There seems to be a personification. 'And the *Δόγος* had his face turned toward God'. The gaze of the *Δόγος* is fixed on God as the gaze of the Christian on the glory of the Lord (2 Cor. 3, 18), a transforming gaze. One recalls Dante.

Beatrice in sul sinistro fianco
Vidi rivolta e riguardar nel Sole:
Aquila sì non gli s'affisse unquanco.

One remembers that the eagle is the symbol of St. John. On *πρὸς* and its mutuality see A. J. P. XII 386. One brings away a confused notion of a diptych, made up of *λόγος* and *θεός*, *texte avec traduction en regard*, the one the mirror of the other. Here, then, is a point where, if anywhere, one needs the specialist. Of course, Dr. Abbott discusses the passage at great length and comes to the following conclusion, if it can be called a conclusion. 'Probably John combines the spiritual meaning "devoted to" with the more local meaning "in converse with" and in his own mind the former is predominant' (p. 275).

The next thing our imaginary student would notice is the asyndetic character of the opening verses, very childlike or very profound. Asyndeton may be either, may be both.¹ In a language full of hooks and eyes, like the Greek, asyndeton is always noteworthy. The Pindaric student will remember Disson's long excursus on the subject, and be prepared for a minute discussion on the part of any one who should take the document seriously. For eleven verses there is nothing to connect the sentences. True, in good time we are to have καί and δέ and οὖν and γάρ. Nay, there will be a καίτοιγε to startle us out of our propriety, but that is a very meagre assortment compared with the wealth of Plato's particles. And we soon begin to miss μέν.² We have δέ. Where is μέν?

Δέκατον μὲν ἔτος τόδ' ἐπεὶ Πριάμου
Μενέλαος ἄναξ ἦδ' Ἀγαμέμνων.

Where is the other member of the ὀχυρὸν ζεύγος Ἀτρεΐδων? There is antithesis enough in the thought as one reads on, and it is often hard to keep from interpolating μέν. 'John,' says Dr. Abbott (p. 70), 'abounds in instances of asyndeton of the most varied and unexpected kinds too numerous to quote', contrasts the usage of the other evangelists, comparing Jno. 1, 26, with Mark 1, 8, Matth. 3, 11, Lk. 3, 16, and gives a classification of asyndeton according to the part of speech with which the conjunction is omitted—a rather mechanical classification, but still a classification.

On v. 5 one stops to ask whether αὐτό is *ipsum* or *id.* The question recurs in every phase of Greek and authors seem to vary. In some of them the neuter is seldom used in other than the emphatic sense. Plato, as usual, is capricious but the point has not been clarified yet. But one thing soon makes itself felt and 'crisps the nerves' of the Hellenist, the overdoing of the unemphatic αὐτοῦ, on which we find a long and instructive chapter in Dr. Abbott, p. 414 foll.

v. 7 οὗτος ἦλθεν. οὗτος the dominant demonstrative comes early, ἐκεῖνος is not uncommon, but where is ὅδε, to which the grammars give the second place in the familiar group? But ὅδε is a very uncertain quantity (A. J. P. XXIII 124). It belongs chiefly to dramatic literature, where it sometimes abounds to the overwhelming of οὗτος and ἐκεῖνος, which elsewhere override or efface it. In Eur. I. T., for instance, ὅδε outnumbers οὗτος four times, and there is a mere trace of ἐκεῖνος. The use, the proportion and the

¹ The Evangelist', says Negri, Julian the Apostate, p. 236 (Engl. tr.), 'introduces certain solemn theses, which sound like trumpet blasts in the mysterious silence'. 'Die Originalität seines Denkens rückt ihn in die erste Klasse der altchristlichen Autoren: aber die berechnete Stilisierung und Erfindung machen doch einen merklichen Unterschied gegen Paulus und die rhetorische Form des Prologes ist ohne das Vorbild der Heraklitsprüche kaum begreiflich', v. Wilamowitz-Moellendorf, Griechische Literatur, p. 188.

² 7, 12.: οἱ μὲν—ἄλλοι [δέ] and outside our limits 16, 9: μὲν . . . δέ—δέ, μέντοι occurs 4, 27. Perhaps μέν was felt as μήν. Only there is no μήν in this sphere, only ἀμήν.

distribution of these demonstratives have not received the attention due—as I have found by personal studies in this domain—and the first serious discussion of *ἐκεῖνος* is as recent as the article by Havers, *Das Pronomen der Jener-deixis im Griechischen in die Indogermanische Forschungen* Bd. XIX 1906. *ἐκεῖνος* plays an important rôle in St. John, and the treatment of it is not neglected by Dr. Abbott, pp. 283–285, pp. 567 foll. The effect of the absence of *ὅδε* does not seem to have been considered.

v. 9 τὸ φῶς τὸ ἀληθινόν is the rhetorical position (A. J. P. XXIII 8), the *ὅγκος* position, but as it shows itself sporadically in the most simple Greek, it does not attract attention until it has recurred a comparatively large number of times. In the days when scholars sniffed Hebraisms everywhere, it might have been observed that this is the normal position in Hebrew, and is to be expected in the Greek of the Septuagint, but we have learned better. Dr. Abbott maintains the *ὅγκος* effect in this sphere of Greek which is revealing itself more and more as popular Greek. In his treatment of the article which takes up pp. 47–68, he says that ‘John as a rule reduplicates the article only in utterances of the Lord or in weighty sayings about Him as in the prologue, “This was the light, the true [light]”. In the less weighty clauses of the Lord’s utterances he does not reduplicate it, as in “the true worshippers” contrasted with “I am the vine, the true vine” (15, 1). It is curious to find such a vindication of Aristotle’s rule in this sphere. Aristophanes has the position not infrequently, and a mock *ὅγκος* would be in keeping with his comic force, but there is danger of overinterpretation in Aristophanes, if not in St. John.

With v. 14 the narrative proper begins, and we are not surprised to find that it opens with an historical present—though not that variety of the historical present, called the annalistic present which occurs in the first words of the Anabasis. The historical present belongs to folk speech, and did not come into literature until the dramatists brought it in. We look for it at the turning points of the narrative, where the interest is quickened, but no one has yet formulated its behavior satisfactorily (A. J. P. XXIII 245). ‘The historic present’, says Dr. Abbott, ‘which is much more frequent in Mark than in the other synoptists, is also a striking characteristic of John’ and then he proceeds to show the difference between Mark and John, which would not interest the student of the Oxyrhynchus fragment. The practical absence of it from the third gospel has been emphasized before as a characteristic of Luke, who has stylistic ambitions (A. J. P. XIV 106, XVI 259, XX 109).

v. 15 πρῶτός μου is comprehensible Greek, and one recalls Od. 11, 482: σείο—μακάριστος, but it is queer Greek for all that. The possessive genitive yields a tolerable explanation, as it does in more instances than one would suppose, but Dr. Abbott, who treats the subject at great length pp. 11–13, finds a special difficulty in the fact that we cannot tell what was the original word employed by the Baptist. Of course, no mere classicist could

be expected to invade that mysterious domain. One is reminded of the problem raised as to the 'Kanzleistil' of the Persian court (A. J. P. XII 518).

v. 17 διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. We had δι' αὐτοῦ before (v. 2), and we shall find διὰ c. gen. many times, and recognize a certain sharpness in its use. In later Greek we have the abomination of διὰ c. gen. of the material, but it is not safe to say that St. John uses διὰ c. gen. for ἐξ. However Justin Martyr has been haled up for heresy on account of his διὰ παρθένου. See my note on J. M. Apol. I c. 22, 15. It is a queer thing, this strictness and this laxness in prepositional use. No Greek, be he ever so humble, would fail to understand δι' ὃν τὰ πάντα καὶ δι' οὗ τὰ πάντα. The two uses are never confounded (see my note on J. M. Apol. I c. 23, 11), and Dr. Abbott keeps them apart, as was to be expected. (See pp. 231 foll.) And yet in other prepositions one notices the inevitable trend toward the accusative. According to the rule that obtains in life, dulness prevails in the long run, and the dullest of the cases, the accusative, gets the better of sentimental dative and clinging genitive. No one used to vulgar speech is shocked beyond measure by ὁ ὢν εἰς τὸν κόλπον τοῦ πατρὸς (v. 18). There is much more of the same sort. But I must renounce a synopsis of Dr. Abbott's treatment of the prepositions, which are of momentous importance in a doctrinal aspect, with which the present writer has nothing to do.

v. 19 ἵνα ἐρωτήσωσιν αὐτόν. Subjunctive after historical tenses. The sequence has nothing surprising about it. Herodotos is fond of it and we know the influence of Herodotos on later Greek. But where it recurs perpetually, one asks: Where is the optative? Can it be that the mood of fancy, the mood of illusion is dead? But let us not be too hasty. There is very little scope for the wishing optative in ordinary prose, and perhaps we shall have that universal favorite, the optative with ἄν, after a while.

v. 27: ἄξιός ἵνα λύσω = ἄξιός λῦσαι shows the degeneracy of the infinitive. But the degeneracy goes almost as far back as original sin. Once admit the final particles into the complementary clause and the mischief is done. But the mischief is as old as Homer, who for the student of historical syntax is the beginning of things; and just see the sweep that *ut* has gained in Latin, so that it is positively bad form to use the infinitive when the infinitive must have reigned by right. However, the business of the student of language is not to protest but to understand. As ἵνα is destined to kill the infinitive, so it kills the future participle which has a feeble life at best. Of course, this would be considered by Dr. Abbott a very trivial observation, and ἵνα is treated at very great length and with a subtlety that shows how necessary it is for the heathen Greek to take the rough shoes of daily wear from off his feet. In 11, 50 we read συμφέρει ἡμῖν ἵνα εἰς ἄνθρωπος ἀποθάνῃ ὑπὲρ τοῦ λαοῦ, in 18, 14: συμφέρει ἓνα ἄνθρωπον ἀποθανεῖν. To the ordinary Hellenist ἵνα is simply going the way that the infinitive went before. Originally both are

apotelesic, but Dr. Abbott sees a special note of preordination in the *ἵνα* form (p. 119).

v. 28 *ὅπου ἦν Ἰωάννης βαπτίζων*. Shall we say glibly = *οὗ Ἰωάννης ἐβαπτίζεν*, as the manner of some is? *μὴ γένοιτο*. The position would show that *ἦν βαπτίζων* is not periphrastic here, however it may be elsewhere. So Dr. Abbott (p. 220): 'In N. T., where *ἦν* is separated from the present participle, it is often better to supply some predicate from the context and to take the participle as in classical Greek, especially in those Gospels where the Hebraic participle is very rare'.

v. 29 *βλέπει . . . ἐρχόμενον*: The participle after verbs of sensuous perception is a native subtlety of the Greek language after which Latin toils in vain. It has not participles enough to vie with the Greek. The participle for sensuous perception, not so often for intellectual perception, *ὅτι* for intellectual perception. The poorest Greek works the rule in an exemplary fashion that may well delight the heart of the schoolmaster. Cf. 5, 6: *τούτον ἰδὼν ὁ Ἰησοῦς κατακείμενον καὶ γνοὺς ὅτι πολὺν ἤδη χρόνον ἔχει*. This distinction is current now, but it is not formulated in the ordinary grammars, and though I have been familiar with it for half a century, I cannot tell who pointed it out first. Dr. Abbott has not thought it worth while to mention it.

v. 35 *πρὸ τοῦ σε φωνῆσαι*. This use of the articular infinitive instead of the idiomatic *πρὶν* with the infinitive seems to have come into the language to satisfy the sense of grammatical propriety. To be sure, we find it first in Thukydides (3, 68, 1) whose sense of grammatical propriety according to some scholars is *nil*, but in later days the Greek may have felt toward it as some people feel toward 'had rather'. It will not 'parse'. The normal *πρὶν ἀποθανεῖν* we shall find elsewhere, e. g. 4, 49. St. John has no fancy for the articular infinitive—a decided contrast to the LXX. (See A. J. P. XXVII 106). Dr. Abbott (p. 69) quotes Bruder as giving 15 art. inf. to Mk., 24 to Matth., 70 to Luke, 4 to Jno., 3 of these *πρὸ τοῦ* and one *διὰ τό*, all very common uses.

v. 36: *ἐμβλέψας . . . λέγει*: The first subordinating participle in the fragment. Is it possible? But here they come v. 36: *ἐμβλέψας*, v. 38: *στραφεὶς καὶ θεασάμενος*, v. 43: *ἐμβλέψας* again. Still *ἀπεκρίθη καὶ εἶπεν* is a formula that recurs over and over again, and the staccato style makes itself felt. So 2, 8: *ἀντλήσατε καὶ φέρετε*, where one might expect even in this sphere *ἀντλήσαντες φέρετε* (A. J. P. XXIII 11).

CHAPTER II v. 15: *τά τε πρόβατα καὶ τοὺς βόας*. Where has *τε*—*καὶ* been all this time? *τε καὶ* is a decided gnomon of literary style. It is seldom used in official inscriptions. The business orators do not favor the construction, as Fuhr remarked long ago, Rh. M. 33, N. F. (1878) 578. Here the coupled *τά τε πρόβατα καὶ τοὺς βόας* sounds like an inherited formula. '*τε* occurs only thrice in this Gospel 2, 15; 4, 42 and 6, 18'.

v. 22: *τεσσεράκοντα καὶ ἑξ ἔτεσιν οἰκοδομήθη*: The dative is not easily paralleled except in later Greek. Dr. Abbott (p. 29)

cites Josephus and Eusebius. 'Always in passages where there is no possibility of confusing the dative of duration with the dative of completion'. A classical scholar cannot chase away the notion of a Latinism. The aorist with definite numbers is used with idiomatic exactness (A. J. P. XXVII 234). So 4, 39: *ἔμεινεν ἐκεῖ δύο ἡμέρας*.

v. 22: *τῷ λόγῳ ὅν*: The attraction of the relative is uniform, in the inferior MSS, and gives an idiomatic touch to the language. But here and in 4, 50 the attraction is pretermitted—for reasons which one must seek in Dr. Abbott himself (p. 298). It is just these refinements of interpretation that justify the mere layman in declining any judgment on matters of N. T. interpretation.

CHAPTER III, v. 2 *οὐδεὶς γὰρ δύναται*. *γὰρ* makes its appearance for the first time. *ἔδωκας ἡμῖν ἀλλὰ σὺν χρόνῳ χαράν*. Find me an equal run of Greek with only one *γὰρ*. The Johannine use of *γὰρ* moves on what we may call the school boy 'for' plane but 4, 45: *καὶ αὐτοὶ γὰρ* shows that the phrasing of *γὰρ* is not lost, even if the feeling is. Here again (p. 101), Dr. Abbott goes into great detail as to the Synoptic and Johannine use, p. 101 foll., and the difference as to the employment in strict narrative and in Christ's words. One cannot help noticing the recurrence of *δύναται*. So again, v. 3 *δύναται ἰδεῖν* and v. 4 *δύναται γεννηθῆναι, δύναται εἰσελθεῖν καὶ γεννηθῆναι*. The recurrence reminds one of the 'dynetic' particle, and one misses the optative and *ἄν*. But there is no optative with *ἄν*, except once outside the limits of our Oxyrhynchus papyrus, and then only in a polite formula, 13, 24: *πυθέσθαι τίς ἂν εἴη περὶ οὗ λέγει*, which like the English rendering 'what may (might) the name be' shows at once that there must be a name, and that the questioner would like to know it. But alas! even that polite formula is rejected by Dr. Abbott. It stands in the *textus receptus*, on which I pencilled my marginal notes. Westcott and Hort have it not, but simply *ἐστίν*. Nor is there any optative conditional. It is a fanciful thing, and might not be needed by sober Christians, who have to deal with eternal verities. 'The optative mood is practically non-existent in the Gospels, except in Luke', says Dr. Abbott, without a sigh. To be sure, it is an old story. The logical condition with its standard of fact, the unreal condition, with its stern appeal to reality, the *ἐάν* condition, with its recognition of the course of things—these must suffice, and of these *ἐάν* dominates. It is the conditional of all work in this sphere. It is the legal conditional, the anticipatory conditional. The logical conditional is used occasionally. It is usually a *pro forma* conditional; and no wonder that (5, 12) it takes *οὐ*. There is no example of the minatory and monitory *εἰ* with the future indicative, which runs through the language from Homer down. But the minatory and monitory formula which I set going some thirty years ago does not seem to have crossed the track of Dr. Abbott's studies. At least whilst he has emphasized the fact that there is no *εἰ* with the future conditional in John (p. 372 note), he does not recognize the applicability of the formula to other

passages cited for the N. T. Of course, the disillusioning conditional cannot be spared in this world of unrealities and shams and the legal condition and the unreal are treated at length by Dr. Abbott. On the difference between aorist and present subjunctive he is as exact as if he were interpreting a classical text, a matter on which I have touched A. J. P. XXIII 241. Delightful is his remark (p. 372 note). 'As for such English phrases as "If he shall come" and "If he shall have come", they are not really English at all, but may perhaps be tolerated in a treatise like this, which sometimes aims at expressing for readers the different shades of meaning in Greek conditional sentences. *If, then, we shall shake off* our slavish yoke Rich. II 2, 1, 291 means "if we are to, or apt to shake off" and even that is quite exceptional'. In other words, 'shall' is the proper rendering of the minatory and monitory conditions. There is no question about it, that the practice of close translation from Latin and Greek has foisted upon our language a lot of unidiomatic syntax, which is never heard in daily speech, but as in the case of slang, we must submit to the enrichment here and there.

v. 16 οὕτω—ὥστε makes its first appearance. There is an unwonted dignity, an unwonted impressiveness about the balanced period (A. J. P. XXIII 256), and the indicative is less common in this sphere than the infinitive, which by a species of atavism regains something of its primitive preponderance (A. J. P. XIV 241; XV 117). But in this passage (Dr. Abbott, p. 537), the reading is disputed; Blass reads *ὅτι* after Chrysostom, whose testimony Dr. Abbott discredits. On the rôle of *ὅτι* in Johannine Grammar Dr. Abbott has a great deal to say (p. 154 foll.). John, it appears, deals largely with causes and uses *ὅτι* very frequently in the sense of 'because'. The causal particles apparently among the most simple are really among the most difficult, when it comes to a question of the original conception. *ὅτι* is only and always 'that'. 'Because' is only a convenient translation. 'That', like *ὅτι*, is an accusative of the inner object, the accusative of the object created. The finite construction of the verbs of emotion in Latin, Greek and English alike, teaches the lesson so much needed, that the primitive conception of the world was 'will'. Here again the grammarian and the theologian go hopelessly apart.

v. 18 *ὅτι μή πεπίστευκεν* is a specimen of the notorious Alabandic solecism, which came up in the first century before Christ. It is one which Lucian would not have noticed; he was addicted to it. Alabanda was in Caria, and the very spite of the saying ἐν καρὶ κίνδυνος ought to keep us alive to the importance of Carian influence. At all events, trying *μή* on a Carian seems to have been a brilliant success. Dr. Abbott (p. 203) says that in John *μή* for *οὐ* is not so frequent as in the synoptists. See on the whole subject A. J. P. I 45 foll.

v. 29 *χαρῇ χαίρει*: A cognate dative which our imaginary classicist might have set down as a bit of folkspeech like the cognate accusative which haunts the higher and the lower ranges of speech.

v. 32: *έώρακε καὶ ἤκουσε*. The change of tense is not surprising to anyone who appreciates the short-hand perfect use of the aorist. Culmination and consummation are not far apart. The large use of the perfect belongs to the sphere of common speech. We are very far from the Homeric use, in which the present end of the perfect, so to speak, is almost always in evidence, as Jakob Wackernagel has lately been at the pains to show. Dr. Abbott (p. 323) calls attention to the points that John has made on the difference between the two tenses, though, more liberal than the Revisers, he admits the aorist as the short-hand of the perfect, where there is no perfect. In the present passage (3, 32) he labors over the difference between the tenses and says that 'as the perfect of *όρᾶν* is the only part of the verb used by John, he might conceivably use the perfect of *όρᾶν*, concerning spiritual vision, parallel to the aorist of another verb'.

CHAPTER IV 14 *οὐ μὴ διψήσῃ*. *οὐ μὴ* like the articular infinitive worked itself up into literature, but only into dramatic literature, which is a glorified form of the spoken language. No wonder that in the Johannine sphere in which we have already seen so many traces of vulgar speech, it exults and abounds (A. J. P. XVIII 453 foll.). '*οὐ μὴ* occurs in John', says Dr. Abbott (p. 205), 'fourteen times with subjunctive and thrice with future', in which he thinks that 'John had in his mind an emphasis laid rather on futurity than on certainty which would have been indicated by the subjunctive'. Of these three only one seems to be absolutely certain, 10, 5: *ἀλλοτρίῳ δὲ οὐ μὴ ἀκολουθήσουσιν ἀλλὰ φεύγονται*, a narrow basis for generalization. Your ordinary, coarse-fibred Hellenist would refuse to accept such subtle intimations in such a sphere.

v. 21 *Γύναι*. We have had *ῥαββί* and *κύριε* before. The absence of *δ*, which we shall find to be steady, is another indication of the meeting of the higher language with folk-speech. See Scott in A. J. P. XXVI 43. Under the vocative Dr. Abbott does not notice the absence of *δ*, but he has naturally something to say (p. 519) about the articular nominative—instead of the vocative—really a bit of apposition. Oddly enough, his parallel is the French 'chose' instead of the French article as in 'la fille'. Familiar Greek is parallel with Hebrew.

v. 23: *ώρα . . . ὅτε προσκυνήσουσι*. It is interesting to find in this sphere a correctness of usage not formulated in the ordinary manuals. *ὅτε* with future indicative is rare. It is used only when there is a definite antecedent and the tendency to *ὅταν* is strong even then as in the famous *ἔσσεται ἡμαρ ὅτ' ἂν ποτ' ὁλόγη* "Ἰλιος ἱρή. Cf. 5, 25: *ἔρχεται ὥρα καὶ νῦν ἐστὶ ὅτε οἱ νεκροὶ ἀκούσονται τῆς φωνῆς κτέ.*

v. 41 πολλῶ: There seems to be no competition on the part of πολύ, which is in some authors the successful rival. (See Helbing, *Der Instrumentalis bei Herodot.* p. 21, much fuller than Joost, *Xenophon*, p. 143).

v. 42: τῇ τε γυναικί. τε here starts the question as to the use of τε in popular speech. See note on 2, 15.

v. 47: ἤμελλε γὰρ ἀποθνήσκειν, an exact use naturally retained in familiar language and in familiar phrases. One might say that the view of death is usually postponed until one is at the point of it, but μέλλω τελευτήσκειν, the more polite synonym, is not uncommon. Unfortunately we shall find that John never uses the future infinitive with μέλλω, and we are not to imitate the example of those who see mountains and marvels in these variations. No remark in Dr. Abbott.

v. 52: ὥραν ἐβδόμην. The accusative triumphs here as with the preposition. If σήμερον and σήμε, why not ὥραν ἐβδόμην? 'It is perhaps vernacular', says Abbott (p. 75), like our 'what time did it happen'? The accusative spreads like lava. See note on 1, 17.

CHAPTER V. v. 7 ἀνθρωπον οὐκ ἔχω ἵνα βάλλῃ where we should expect τὸν βαλοῦντα. ἵνα fatal to so much is fatal to the future participle. See note on 1, 27.

vv. 8. 11: ἄρον—ἦρε, περιπάτει—περιεπάτει, shows that the feeling for the imperative in this sphere is not deadened, nor in fact in any sphere of Greek, though the aorist comes forward where the distinction is not to be insisted on, possibly in the interest of perspicuity. Here again Dr. Abbott takes up his parable (p. 318 foll.), and insists on a sharp distinction everywhere. 'The first aorist imperative is (1) sometimes more definite, (2) sometimes more authoritative, (3) sometimes more solemn than the present imperative, which may denote continuous action. The second aorist has not this solemn or authoritative meaning. Indeed, in special uses the second aorist may be less authoritative than the present.' Needless to say, the difference between present and aorist imperative in the classical domain is a matter of infinite discussion. The prohibitives have a large literature all to themselves. To discuss Dr. Abbott's conclusion would require more space than I have given to a review, already too long.

v. 13 ἐξένευσεν. Here I am tempted to leave the syntactical sphere for a moment, and to remark on the vocabulary. Needless to say, in St. John we are not plagued with literary reminiscences as we are in literary Greek and in literary French. They are delightful to those who understand them, but there are moods in which one welcomes Pierre Loti. ἐξένευσεν is not an allusion to Pindar O. 13, 114: κούφουσιν ἐκνεῦσαι ποσίν. The next thing I shall be told that the Johannine ἐκνεῦσαι is not from ἐκνέω, as if the Biblical narrative were superior to plays on words.

v. 39 ἐραυνᾶτε τὰς γραφάς: A famous ἀμφιβολία. Is it 'Ye search' or 'Search ye'. How we welcome the negative! How we

welcome the aorist! There is no balm in the Gilead of grammarians. In the Trans. Am. Phil. Ass. XXXII 64 foll., Professor Harry undertook to show that ὁρᾶτε is always present indicative. The thesis would seem to be *a priori* hopeless in view of the large number of ὄρα's about which there can be no ambiguity, but Professor Harry falls back on intellectual vision as opposed to sensuous perception, and Dr. Abbott, on the other hand, maintains (p. 678) that initial ὁρᾶτε in the scenic poets probably always means 'See' and cites this same passage of Aeschyl. P. V. 119 that started Professor Harry on his crusade in behalf of the indicative. That ἐραυνᾶτε is indicative here Dr. Abbott and Professor Harry are agreed.

CHAPTER VI. v. 19 εὐθέως τὸ πλοῖον ἐγένετο ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς: It may be said that the ship was beached, which would be the normal Attic prose use, but ἐπὶ is a ticklish preposition in any sphere of Greek and dissertations have been written on it. Dr. Abbott touches this passage lightly (p. 261), but naturally has a great deal to say about ἐπὶ τῆς θαλάσσης.

VI 28 τί ποιοῦμεν; The conative present instead of the subjunctive appears in all spheres that admit of dramatic excitement.

The chapters that follow those which are embraced in the supposed Oxyrhynchus fragment show among other things how dangerous it is to reason from even so considerable a find as to the usage of an author. So καὶ—δέ does not occur until 8, 15. The so-called Ionic ὅστις = ὅς first shows its head in 8, 53. The desiderated optative with ἄν turns up 13, 24, but only in the *textus receptus*; see notes on 1, 17; 3, 2. The third attributive position makes its solitary appearance in 14, 27 (Abbott, p. 68). σύν does not come to light until 18, 1 (cf. A. J. P. VIII 221).

Still these few examples of a few chapters would suffice to show that the fragment is not a mere jargon. It is real Greek of a kind. The oriental words that we notice are unassimilated bits. Lange suspected βάλε in Alkman of being a Lydian reminiscence of Baal parallel with εἶθε = εἰ θεός, to which he might have added τί δαί(μων), 'what the devil', if he had been capable of a joke. It is not a Greek that wells up from the heart of national life, but it is a Greek that has been picked up from Greek speaking people, and has its lesson for all those who desire to penetrate into the actual life of that wonderful language.

The glimpses I have given of Dr. Abbott's volume may serve, however imperfectly, to show that the 'tiptilted' attitude is not the proper one for the grammatical nose of the lover of Attic literature, when he comes into the neighborhood of Siloa's brook, and all who do must study Dr. Abbott and forget the observations of the stage heathen, who has commented perhaps too frivolously on this valuable book.

BASIL L. GILDERSLEEVE.